

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

	_ /
STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE tates Patent and Trademark Office OMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS 0. Box 1450 exandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.ustolo.gov	

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/608,816	06/30/2000	John Potter	24,576-02	2383	
7590 10/04/2003			EXAMINER		
JOHN F. KLOS FULLBRIGHT & JAWORSKI 225 SOUTH SIXTH STREET				DORSEY, DENNIS	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
SUITE 4850			3637		
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-4320			DATE MAILED: 10/04/2003	3	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
				(
Office Action Summary	09/608,816	JOHN POTTER	<u>&</u>			
Office Action Summary		Examiner Demois L Demos	Art Unit			
<u> </u>	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	Dennis L Dorsey pears on the cover sheet	3637 with the correspondence ad	dress		
Period fo	· ·		,			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may y within the statutory minimum of t will apply and will expire SIX (6) Mind, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed hirty (30) days will be considered timely ONTHS from the mailing date of this of ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03.0	<u>lune 2003</u> .				
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Th	is action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowed			e merits is		
Disposit	closed in accordance with the practice under a ion of Claims	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 (J.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application	l.				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.		•			
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
	ion Papers	•				
, —	The specification is objected to by the Examine					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accep					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11)☑ The proposed drawing correction filed on <u>08 September 2002</u> is: a)☑ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
11)[•	approved b) disapproved	by the Examiner.		
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.						
. /—	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	G				
-	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C	C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
* 5	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bulies the attached detailed Office action for a list	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))).	Stage		
14)⊠ A	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	c priority under 35 U.S.0	C. § 119(e) (to a provisional	application).		
) \square The translation of the foreign language pro Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti	* *				
Attachmen	t(s)					
2) Notic	ee of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice	w Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(of Informal Patent Application (PT0			

Application/Control Number: 09/608,816

Art Unit: 3637

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rehbein Patent Number 4,028,858 in view of Clear Patent Number 4,944,127 and Clement Patent Number 3,504,472.

Rehbein '858 teaches all the limitations of the claims except panel with two layers. Rehbein '858 teaches the use of deck blocks (1) to build a deck over substructure or joints (9), panel supports (3) support the panels on the deck, the panel supports extend upwardly away from the top longitudinal surface of the joist (9) and has a height less than the thickness of the panel (1) and the gap is less than the block thickness (see Figure 2), and panels are abutting at the ends to form a deck surface.

Clear '127 teaches a flooring panel with a top layer (14) that is inflexible and made of concrete, adhesively secured to a lower flexible layer (18), both layers have substantially the same size, and square in shape (see Figure 1). Clear '127 further teaches that the panels can be manufactured without the tongue and grooves. Clement '472 teaches a flooring substructure with a first portion (20) and a second portion (24) for supporting individual premanufactured concrete panels (28).

Application/Control Number: 09/608,816

Art Unit: 3637

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the all wood block for a two layer panel since it is held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material as taught by Clear '427 for the intended use as a matter of design choice.

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the Clement support structure for the Rehbein support since it is held to be within the skill of a worker in the art to select a known support panel as taught by Clement to provide a stronger support when using the two layer panel.

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the height of the support shorter than the thickness of the panel and make the gap between the panels smaller as well since it is held to be an obvious design choice as taught by Rehbein, requiring only routine skill in the art.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis L Dorsey whose telephone number is 703-306-9137. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00 am-5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on 703-308-2486. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 3637

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1020.

September 26, 2003

LANNA MAI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

lamama